

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed March 29, 2004, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments and remarks contained herein place the instant application in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,959,855 to Daudelin in view of U.S. Patent 6,327,346 to Infosino ("Infosino"). By this Amendment, claims 1, 6-8, 13, 16-17, 19-21, 23-26 and 28 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-28 are pending. Applicants traverse the rejections as follows.

Applicants have herein amended claim 1 to recite, in part, "wherein the intelligent resource server is also for receiving the second communication from the telecommunications device via the switch, for playing a second audible message for the telecommunications user in response to receiving the second communication, the second message prompting the telecommunications user to modify a call forwarding profile associated with the telecommunications user."

Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is not obvious in view of Daudelin and Infosino because the references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1. *See MPEP § 2142* (stating that one of the elements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness is that "the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations"). Applicants submit that Daudelin and Infosino, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least, "wherein the intelligent resource server is also for receiving the second communication from the telecommunications device via the switch, for playing a second audible message for the telecommunications user in response to receiving the

second communication, the second message prompting the telecommunications user to modify a call forwarding profile associated with the telecommunications user,” as recited in amended claim 1.

Applicants submit that Daudelin fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of amended claim 1. Daudelin is directed to a directory assistance system, wherein the directory assistance system provides a customer with the option of connecting to a desired party after the customer receives directory listing information concerning the desired party. (*See Daudelin* at col. 1, lns. 49-55.) Applicants submit that Daudelin does not teach or suggest any aspect of call forwarding, let alone, “wherein the intelligent resource server is also for receiving the second communication from the telecommunications device via the switch, for playing a second audible message for the telecommunications user in response to receiving the second communication, the second message prompting the telecommunications user to modify a call forwarding profile associated with the telecommunications user,” as recited in amended claim 1.

Applicants also submit that Infosino fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of amended claim 1. Infosino is directed to customized call processing based on voice identification of users, who are registered in a user profile database. (*See Infosino* at col. 1, lines. 25-33.) Applicants submit that Inforsino, like Daudelin, fails to teach or suggest, among other things, any kind of call forwarding, much less the features recited in amended claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not obvious in view of Daudelin and Infosino. Further, Applicants submit that claims 2-7, which depend from claim 1, are also nonobvious in view of the references cited in the Office Action. *See MPEP § 2143.03* (if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious).

Independent claims 8, 16, 20 and 24 have also been amended to contain language similar

to amended claim 1. Therefore, for reasons analogous to those set forth previously with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that independent claims 8, 16, 20 and 24, as well as their respective dependent claims, 9-15, 17-19, 21-23, and 25-28, are not obvious in view of the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance for the subject application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that the subject application is in condition for disposition other than allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below, in order that the Examiner's concerns may be expeditiously addressed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

June 29, 2004

Robert A. Muha

Robert A. Muha
Reg. No. 44,249

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART, LLP
Henry W. Oliver Building
535 Smithfield Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

Telephone: (412) 355-8244
Facsimile: (412) 355-6501
E-mail: rmuha@kl.com